



DAYLIGHT

Creation Science for Catholics

No. 31



Summer 2001



£1

Editorial	1
The Creation of Man and the Fall.	
— Rev. W. Wilmers, S.J.	3
Our Amazing Ancestors — Geoff Chapman	23
The Bible Alone is Not Enough [Part I] —	25
Wallace Johnson on Evolution: on CD-ROM	
Review — Anthony Nevard	29
"Spectrum" : extracts from letters —	30
Financial Statement Jan. 2000 - Dec. 2000 —	31
Our Heavenly Patrons — Anthony Nevard	32

Editor: Anthony L. G. Nevard B.Sc. P.G.T.C.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES [4 issues]

UK, Ireland, Europe:- £ 8

Outside Europe:- Air: £ 12 (\$ 20) Surface: £ 8 (\$ 15)

Cheques etc. in British Sterling only, please, payable to :

DAYLIGHT ORIGINS SOCIETY

Cash payment acceptable in £ Sterling or US \$ only.

Please address all communications to the Secretary and Editor

A.L.G. Nevard

19 Francis Avenue, St.Albans, Herts AL3 6BL, ENGLAND.

☎ 01727 868427 [Evenings and weekends only, please.]



Editorial

Catholics who openly oppose the Theory of Evolution will invariably meet the response by some others that they are adopting the beliefs of Protestant Fundamentalists. This is justified to the extent that we do share many Christian doctrines, including the dogma that God Himself is the author of all the books of Scripture, which must therefore be free from error in their entirety, and that truths established through Science can never be opposed to these divinely inspired writings. Sadly, these critics confuse unproven hypotheses with truly established scientific evidence and seem to be ignorant of the constant Tradition of the Church, and continuing authority under the living Magisterium [teaching authority] on which the "Catholic creationist" position is based.

Non-Catholic "Biblical Creationists" start from these principles:

1. The foundation of our belief in creation is the Bible, the Word of God, which is the Christian's sole source of absolute authority.
2. The Word of God consists of both the Old and New Testaments, mediated through human authors, who were nevertheless infallibly guided by the Holy Spirit in their writing. (2 Tim.3:16).
3. This necessarily implies verbal inspiration of the original manuscripts and freedom from error not only in spiritual matters but also in references to, or accounts of nature and history (2 Pet. 1:20-21). ¹

Logically, it cannot be proved that the modern Bible is entirely free from error by quoting just two passages written in it; there must be an external authority. In any case, the Canon of the New Testament was not settled until the Council of Carthage in 397 A.D. What we read in Scripture cannot be reliably interpreted by the unguided individual. On whose authority could we know which books were inspired, that no errors had occurred in copying or translation, and whether the passage was intended to be taken as literal scientific or historical fact, poetry or allegory? Only the Catholic Church, with the authority given to St Peter by Jesus Christ Himself, can be proved to have the power of the Holy Ghost to determine and interpret the Biblical Canon.

As the Catholic Church accepts the Book of Genesis as historically true, (albeit not in precise scientific terms) we share many beliefs about Origins with "Fundamentalist Protestants", though we completely reject that label. Our yardstick is whether our interpretations measure up to Tradition, our guarantee of being consistent with the teachings of Christ.

We base our judgments and opinions on many grounds, including our powers of reason, sensory experience and the authority of other people. Divine Faith, as a theological virtue, is based on the testimony of God, and is a supernatural

gift of God we receive at Baptism. Since Faith is necessary for salvation, Christ must have left us a certain means for all to come to the Truth. This must be *plain, universal* and *certain*. Scripture alone cannot be *plain*: for centuries there were no printed Bibles and most people could not read. It cannot include every revealed truth: Scripture does not tell us how many Sacred books there are or which are authentic. The innumerable sects that have arisen through contradictory private judgments of the Biblical texts proves that Scripture alone is uncertain.

Tradition refers to the teachings of the Apostles, received from Christ but not explicitly contained in the Scriptures, which they handed down by word of mouth, and other writings such as those of the Fathers, Decrees of Councils and the rites of the Church.

The Catholic Rule of Faith is Scripture and Tradition, both infallibly interpreted by the Catholic Church's teaching authority - the Magisterium. The roundel on our front cover represents *Scripture* by the Book of Genesis; *Tradition* by Mary, the new Eve, crushing the head of the serpent through our Redemption by her Son, Jesus Christ; the *Magisterium* by the Pope and bishops [mitre] transmitting the truths of Scripture and Tradition.

1 Matthews, M., "A Creation Manifesto", *Origins*, Vol. 2, No. 5, October 1988.

The Bible Alone is Not Enough. This set of 25 questions and answers begins in this issue and will be concluded in the next. They are intended to amplify the remarks made in this Editorial and clarify our position to all readers, including several non-Catholics with whom I have previously had cordial correspondence. Let us earnestly pray that our separated brethren may find food for fruitful reflection from our exposition of true Catholic teachings.

Standing Orders for Subscriptions. A few people have been sent account details having requested to pay by standing order. If you do decide to do this, please ensure that you notify me, or send the form back to me and I will forward it to your bank, so I know who has paid what and when. Thank you!

Daylight on the Internet. Several supporters have suggested that I should set up a website but for various reasons this is not practicable on the domestic front at present. However, thanks to the generosity of Donal Foley, a section of his "Theotokos" website has now been dedicated to Daylight and has already aroused some interest and enquiries. He can also receive electronic mail and forward it to me. The details are:

Website: daylight@www.theotokos.org.uk **e-mail:** dfoley@clara.net

Previous instalments under this heading:

Daylight number	Title	Pages
28.	Divine Revelation through the Books of Moses	(17pp)
29.	The Creation of the World in General	(12pp)
30.	The Creation of the Spiritual and Material Worlds	(9 pp)

Catholic Teachings on Biblical Creation— Part IV

The Creation of Man and the Fall

taken from *Handbook of the Christian Religion*

by Rev. W. Wilmers, S.J. Edited by Rev James Conway, S.J.

Benziger Bros, New York. 2nd Edition 1892

C. Man.

106. Man was created by God.

1. After the creation of the material world God proceeded to the chief work of visible creation as indicated by the words: "Let us make man to our own image and likeness. . . . And the Lord God formed man out of the slime of the earth and breathed into his face the breath of life" (Gen. i. 25). Of the creation of animals Scripture says simply: "God made the beasts of the earth according to their kind" (Gen. i. 5), but in man a distinction is made between the formation of the body and its animation by the breath of life. The body is formed of the slime of the earth, the soul infused into it directly by God—created.

Man is therefore created in a stricter sense than other living beings, which are only produced from matter. The *soul* of man is created in the strictest sense of the word, being produced out of nothing, independently of matter. This is not the case with the life-principle of plants and brute animals, which is produced in, and

Man.

dependent on, matter. Neither are our thoughts created, because they do not exist in themselves, but are inherent in the substance of the soul. Since, therefore, the souls of animals are in their existence dependent on matter, so they are also in their origin dependent upon the bodies which they animate. Animal souls are, therefore, in their creation dependent upon matter; and, consequently, the human soul, being independent of matter in its existence, is independent also in its origin, or production—in the strictest sense created.

2. God formed the body of Eve from a rib of Adam. This fact—for as such we are to consider it—was intended to inculcate the duty of the husband to love his wife and of the wife to be submissive to her husband (1 Cor. xi. 8). That God created the soul of Eve from nothing follows from what has been said in regard to the origin of Adam's soul.

Man is, therefore, not the result of spontaneous *evolution*. The assumption that nature originally possessed the power to produce man is most *unscientific*. For natural science, which professes to take its data from facts, contradicts itself if it makes an assumption for which there is no evidence. Where are the facts to prove that man is, or could be, spontaneously developed from inorganic matter? Such an assumption is, moreover, *irrational*. For the cause must be proportioned to its effect; for what is not contained in the cause cannot be produced from it. How, then, can life be generated from what is inanimate (105)? How can a spiritual substance be produced from matter?

If we assume that the first man has developed from a *brute animal*, how comes it that nature has lost the power to produce men from beasts? Even the external structure which distinguishes the ape from man has undergone no change in the course of ages, as may be seen from fossilized remains. Man is more elevated above the brute creation than the latter is above inorganic and organic matter; for the brute animal is altogether material, while the human soul is wholly independent of matter. Therefore, as it is impossible that matter produce animal life, so it is much more impossible that brute animal nature should produce man, endowed as he is with a spiritual soul.

107. The whole human race is descended from one man and one woman, Adam and Eve.

1. That there were no men upon earth before Adam and Eve is manifest from the whole *context of the Bible narrative*. God fitted out the earth, till then unpeopled, for man. Moreover, after describing the gradual completion and embellishment of the earth, Scripture says: "There was *not* a man

Man the Image of God.

to till the earth" (Gen. ii. 5). "And Adam called the name of his wife Eve, because she was the mother of *all the living*" (Gen. iii. 20). How Adam and Eve's descendants gradually spread over the earth we learn from the same historic record. St. Paul teaches the same truth to the Athenians: "God hath made of *one* all mankind to dwell upon the whole face of the earth" (Acts xvii. 26; cf. Wis. x. 1).

2. This truth is closely connected with the *doctrine of original sin*, which teaches that sin was transmitted by one man to all posterity, and with the dogma of the *redemption* of all mankind, who *all* had sinned in Adam.

The descent of the whole human family from one man and one woman is a fact which can be proved with certainty only from divine revelation. But that all men form *one species*, that the different races are but one and the same species, may be demonstrated from reason. The *test of species* is the power of reproduction and continued fecundity. Now, we find that intermarriages between the most opposite races of man are indefinitely fruitful. Hence we must conclude that man forms but one species. Besides, the *physical organization* is essentially the same in all races. The differences, comparatively slight, are chiefly owing to climatic influences. These modifications being transmitted by heredity give rise to the so-called *races*. Moreover, *philological researches* point to the unity of the human species, inasmuch as they establish with strong probability the fact that the human race originally spoke one language; nor is it to be overlooked, finally, that the most *ancient monuments* point to Asia as the cradle of mankind.

According to the Hebrew text of the Bible, with which the Latin Vulgate agrees, the period from the *creation of man* to the birth of Christ is about four thousand years; according to the Greek version of the Septuagint it is more than five thousand years. The chronologies of certain nations that claim a much greater antiquity deserve no credit, since they are proved to be utterly fabulous. The inaccuracy of Egyptian chronology in particular has become more and more evident of late years. If—what is very doubtful—traces of human beings have been found in the lower strata of the earth's surface, together with the remains of animals now extinct, it still remains to be proved that such species of animals had become extinct *before* the time assigned for the creation of man; and, furthermore, that such human remains have been naturally deposited there, and not, as may easily happen, especially in river-beds, brought there by some violent catastrophe or accidental cause. Neither the one nor the other can be proved.

108. Man was created to God's own image and likeness.

This prerogative of man includes two things: first, a likeness to

Man.

God in His attributes, as two brothers may be said to be like each other; and, secondly, an image of God as of a prototype, or model, as a son may be said to be the likeness of his father.

God made man to His *own image and likeness* by the fact that He endowed him with prerogatives which gave him a resemblance, however imperfect, to Himself. "Let us make man to our image and likeness, and let him have dominion over the fishes of the sea, and the fowls of the air, and the beasts, and the whole earth, and every creeping creature that moveth upon the earth" (Gen. i. 26). Man is, therefore, the image of God by the fact that he has dominion over this earth, as God has dominion over the whole universe. Now, this dominion presupposes certain intrinsic endowments in man; for he is made lord of the earth because he surpasses all visible creatures in excellence.

Those prerogatives which render man the image of God and the ruler of the earth were of two kinds: *natural and supernatural*. Adam, our first parent, was, therefore, both the natural and the supernatural image and likeness of God.

109. Man is the natural image and likeness of God in virtue of the natural endowments of his soul, i.e.—its spirituality, freedom, and immortality.

The natural gifts which constitute the natural image and likeness of God are those that are given to man as part of his human nature. That is said to be *natural* which belongs to the integrity of nature, either as forming part of it, or resulting from it, or in some way due to it. Body and soul are *essential parts* of man's nature; from the spiritual nature of the soul *result* intellect and free will; God's preserving influence is *due* to the human soul; for God would contradict His own design if He withheld His preservation from it, since its nature demands immortality. Body and soul, free will, immortality, are, therefore, gifts of the natural order, and constitute man's natural likeness to God. This likeness, however, is to be found chiefly in the soul, not in the body.

I. Spirituality, freedom, and immortality render man like to God.

1. The human soul, according to the teaching of revelation, is a *spirit*. (a) The spiritual nature of the soul may be inferred from its *origin*. It is not made of earth like the body, nor dependent upon matter like the souls of beasts (105); it

Man the Natural Image of God.

is breathed into the body by God; i.e., immediately produced by God's action independently of matter. Moreover, the soul is expressly *called a spirit*, which returns "to God who hath given it" (Eccles. xii. 7). Now, by a spirit we understand a substance endowed with reason and free will, independent of matter. (b) The Lateran Creed expresses the *belief of the Church* in the spirituality of the soul when it teaches that "God created the *spiritual* and *material* world, and *man* consisting of *spirit* and *body*."

Now, in virtue of his spiritual soul man is a rational being, and as such *the likeness of God*, first of all, because he has dominion over the earth (108). What is the foundation of dominion in general? Reason; for reason alone makes one capable of disposing of a thing, since only a rational being knows how to direct a thing to an appointed end. But considered even in itself the soul of man, by its rational and spiritual nature, comes nearer to God, who is a spirit, and reflects His essence more perfectly than any other terrestrial being (cf. S. Aug. Serin. 44. c. 2).

2. The *freedom* of the human will is manifest from the precept given by God to our first parents, and from the punishment threatened them. Precept and punishment can be imposed only upon free agents. The frequent warnings of God to men are but as many evidences of man's free will. "God made man from the beginning, and left him in the hands of his own counsel. He added His commandments and precepts. . . . He hath set water and fire before thee; stretch forth thy hand to which thou wilt. Before man is life and death; good and evil; that which he shall choose shall be given him" (Ecclus. xv. 14-18). But in his present state man is also free; for in his present state also *commandments and precepts* are enjoined on him.

Free will constitutes man the *image* of God. It is not knowledge alone, but also the power of *free choice*, that makes him capable of dominion over God's visible creatures; for it is the power of free disposal of a thing to a freely chosen end that makes one master of it. Moreover, free will, like reason,

Man.

elevates man above the brute animal, and thus brings him nearer to the perfection of God, who is free in all His external actions.

3. The human soul is *immortal*. For while the body of man returns to the earth, the spirit returns to God, who gave it (Eccles. xii. 7). All those passages of Scripture which hold out to us an eternal reward or punishment testify to the immortality of the soul. This is one of the fundamental truths upon which religion in general, and Christianity in particular, is based. For, what would religion be without the belief in an eternal retribution? If there were no eternal life, the incarnation of the Son of God, to redeem us from eternal damnation and make us partakers of eternal happiness, would be meaningless. The Church, which in its creeds always professed its belief in the *life everlasting*, in the Fifth Lateran Council solemnly condemned those who assert that the human soul is mortal.

The immortality of the soul is another trait of man's *likeness* to God. It is no small prerogative of man that while all other living beings on this earth pass away the human soul alone lives forever, and thus resembles its creator.

II. Spirituality, freedom, and immortality are *natural endowments*, and therefore constitute man the *natural image* of God. They are natural endowments because they belong to the nature of man and are inseparable from it. While Scripture teaches, on the one hand, that man by his fall lost certain of his gifts, it assures us, on the other hand, that these natural endowments remained to him after his fall (112, 114). It distinguishes, therefore, between the gifts conferred on man, and indicates that those which remained are not of the supernatural order. Apart from revelation, however, it is easy to prove that the aforesaid prerogatives essentially belong to rational nature, and, consequently, that they are *natural gifts*.

1. The human soul is a *spirit*, i.e., a simple substance, independent of matter.

a. That the human soul is a *substance* is manifest from the consciousness which each individual has that one permanent subject

Man the Natural Image of God.

underlies all the various acts of his mind and will. Such a permanent subject, maintaining its identity under diverse changes and modifications, is called a substance. Without this unity of subject in the various impressions memory and reason could not exist.

b. The human soul is a *simple* substance, i.e., unextended, indivisible, without composition of parts. We are conscious of our thoughts, judgments, and volitions, and express this consciousness by saying: I think, I judge, I will. Now, if the soul were not simple, these acts would proceed from, and be received in, different parts of it; so that we would not be one, but many, thinking, judging, and wishing subjects. But that is contrary to experience, which testifies the greatest unity in the subject of the inward acts of our souls.

c. The soul is a *spiritual* substance, i.e., is independent of matter. We learn the nature of a being from its acts. For acts are, as it were, the product or effect of being, and cannot be more perfect than the being itself. If we prove that the soul of man performs spiritual acts transcending the power of the sense, we thereby prove that its nature is spiritual. Now, the soul performs these spiritual acts when it conceives things purely spiritual. Thus, for instance, spirit, eternity, God, is something altogether beyond the perception of the senses. Again, the soul performs a spiritual act when it conceives material things; for it conceives the material in an immaterial way: it conceives it from a supersensuous aspect, raises it to an immaterial state of being; for it abstracts from material and individual things the *universal*, which does not exist as such in the things themselves. It conceives the essence of things without those qualities which come under the senses. It conceives in things the hidden substance underlying the sensible properties; in short, by its whole manner of acting the mind proves itself to be superior to the senses. The soul, moreover, performs spiritual acts by the *will*. For the will loves that which is spiritual, e.g., virtue, eternal happiness, God Himself, which are not objects of sense.

Besides the purely spiritual acts, the soul is also endowed with *sensitive perception and sensitive appetit*, which reside in material organs, and which can reach only material objects. To the latter belongs the imagination, whose organ is the brain, and whose activity must as a necessary condition continually accompany the operations of the intellect. Hence it happens that a derangement of the brain interferes with the functions of the mind, though the latter itself and its product, thought, are inorganic, or spiritual.

d. In man the *same rational soul* is the principle of the different vital functions: of the intellectual or spiritual, which we have in common with pure spirits; and of the sensitive, which we have in common with irrational animals; and of the vegetative, which we have in common with plants. We distinguish three kinds of life: *vegetative*, whose functions are nutrition, growth, and reproduction; *sensitive*, whose functions are sensitive perception, appetite, and locomotion; *intellectual*, to which belong the functions of supersensuous cognition and volition. There are, accordingly, three kinds of life-principles, or souls: the vegetative in plants, the sensitive in brute animals, and the intellectual in man. The intellectual soul in

Man.

man, however, performs all the three species of vital functions, as is manifest from the unity of consciousness; for one and the same subject within us is conscious of thought, sensation, and other sensitive and vegetative functions, which would not be the case if those various operations proceeded from distinct principles. Hence man has been rightly defined as a rational animal, as being endowed with a rational soul animating a sensitive body (cf. S. Aug. de civ. Dei, v. 11).

Hence we see that man is composed of two distinct elements: one *material* (body), the other *spiritual* (soul), both constituting one complete substance (man). The active, determining, differentiating element is the soul, which gives activity, form, and species to man. Hence the soul is called the *substantial form* of the body, since by its immediate and substantial union with the body it constitutes it a true human body. That the rational soul of man is the *form* of the body is a *dogma* defined by the Council of Vienne. It is, therefore, no mere philosophical question, as is evident also from its intimate connection with the doctrine of the Incarnation, or the true humanity of Christ. Therefore the Church was justified in defining it.

2. The soul of man is naturally endowed with *free will*. Freedom is an outcome of the spiritual nature of the soul. As the mind does not necessarily conceive things as they present themselves to the senses, but may regard them in various relations, which transcend the power of sense, so volition is not dependent on sensitive impressions. The will may, therefore, choose or reject an object for various reasons, since the intellect may regard it under different aspects as profitable, hurtful, etc. Moreover, the freedom of the human will is not only an evident internal fact, of which every human being is conscious, but it is also the groundwork of all morality, and the basis of all civil and social life.

3. The human soul is of its nature *immortal*, and as such will be eternally preserved by God.

1. A being is by its *nature* immortal which does not contain in itself any cause of dissolution or decay, and which cannot be deprived of life by any natural power. The human soul is immortal if it cannot, either *directly* of its own nature or *indirectly* by the dissolution of the body, be deprived of its existence.

(1) The soul cannot be deprived of existence *directly*. The direct destruction of a substance by natural means can take place only by dissolution, by disintegration of its parts. But the human soul is simple, it does not consist of parts. Therefore it cannot be dissolved into parts. Neither can it be annihilated as long as God wishes to preserve it. Hence it cannot be directly deprived of existence.

(2) Nor can the soul be deprived of existence *indirectly*, i.e., by separation from the body. For, as a spiritual substance it is independent of the body in its existence and its proper activity, and can, therefore, continue to perform its essential functions even after the dissolution of the body. While the animal soul, which is altogether dependent on the body, by the destruction of the body loses its activity, the human soul, being independent of the body, remains

Man the Supernatural Image of God.

essentially the same, losing only the use of those faculties which cannot act without the aid of organs, but retaining the spiritual faculties of thought and free choice, which are independent of organs. The necessity of the external co-operation of the organic faculties in intellectual cognition, which now exists, owing to the union of soul and body, will cease to exist in the state of separation. The separated soul will act after the manner of pure spirits.

b. God will eternally preserve the soul in existence.

(1) God would contradict Himself if He deprived of existence that soul which He created for immortality. But God, as we have shown, created the human soul for eternity, since of its nature it can continue to exist forever and fulfil the end of its existence by the exercise of its spiritual functions. Therefore God will not annihilate the human soul, but preserve it forever.

(2) God, the supreme lawgiver, must have given a sufficient sanction to the natural law by *duly rewarding good and punishing evil*. But in this life there are not sufficient rewards and punishments to secure the observance of the moral law; for remorse of conscience, which might be considered a punishment for crime, chastises only the criminal who fears future punishment. Therefore a future life must exist in which virtue receives its reward and vice its punishment. And this future life must be *everlasting*, for only the hope of an eternal recompense or the fear of an eternal punishment is a sufficient motive to counteract the present allurements of sin.

(3) The firm conviction of the immortality of the soul, and of an eternal retribution, is to be found not only among the Jews, who walked in the light of revelation, but even among *pagan nations*. Whether we look upon this universal belief as a trace of revelation or not, yet it is evident that it could not have taken such deep root in all mankind if it had not found a strong support in rational nature, which naturally yearns for immortality, and conceives God as an eternal and just judge.

110. Man was at the same time, in virtue of his supernatural gifts, created to the supernatural image and likeness of God.

We call that supernatural which exceeds the powers and the exigence of nature. A gift may be supernatural in two ways: either in the *manner* in which it is given (*quoad modum*), or in its *substance* (*quoad substantiam*). A natural gift which is bestowed in a supernatural way is supernatural only in *manner*. Health, for instance, is in itself something natural, but it becomes supernatural in manner if it is miraculously preserved or restored. Sanctifying grace and the beatific vision are supernatural in *substance*, as simply transcending nature. What is supernatural in *substance* may be either *relatively* or *absolutely* supernatural. *Relatively* supernatural is that which transcends the capacity or exigence only of certain creatures. Thus immortality is supernatural to *man*, but not to angels. *Absolutely* supernatural is that which exceeds the power and exigence of all nature. Such is the contemplation of God face to face and sanc-

Man.

tifying grace, since these gifts raise man to a *higher order* surpassing all natural power. All other gifts which do not appertain to man's nature and are nowise due to it—for instance, the immortality of the body, immunity from concupiscence, divinely infused knowledge—would not raise him above the whole order of nature. They are, therefore, called *preternatural* gifts.

I. God conferred upon our first parents *supernatural gifts*.

1. He adorned them with *sanctifying grace*, and with the virtues of faith, hope, charity, etc., which are infused into the soul with sanctifying grace.

a. The passage, "Let us make man to our own image and likeness" (Gen. i. 26), is interpreted by the fathers to refer to the supernatural as well as the natural *image* and *likeness* of God. Again we read: "Only this I have found that God made man right; and he hath entangled himself with an infinity of questions" (Eccles. vii. 30). Here Scripture calls man *right* in the sense in which the saints are generally called right or just; for speaking of the justice of the saints, which consists in sanctifying grace, it makes use of the same expression with which it here characterizes the original condition of the first man.

b. Christ is represented in Scripture as the *restorer* of the primitive order lost by sin, as the regainer of the inheritance lost by our first parent (Rom. v. 18). But what Christ regained and restored to us, as Scripture repeatedly teaches (cf. Eph. i. 3-8; Rom. viii. 17), was sanctifying grace. Therefore man was originally adorned with sanctifying grace.

c. It is the constant *tradition* of the Church that our first parent Adam was endowed with sanctifying grace. The Council of Trent (Sess. v. can. 1) as well as the Second Council of Orange (A.D. 529) defined this truth in the clearest terms.

2. In the gift of sanctifying grace was included man's destination for the *beatific vision*. For, if Christ is the restorer of original grace lost through Adam, and if that restoration includes the right to the beatific vision, it follows that the same supernatural gift was connected with original justice conferred on our first parents. But Scripture tells us in the plainest terms that man's right to the beatific vision is connected with that grace which Christ has merited for us.

Man the Supernatural Image of God.

“Behold what manner of charity the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called, and should be, the *sons of God*. . . . We are now the sons of God, and it hath not yet appeared what we shall be. We know that when He shall appear we shall be like to Him, because *we shall see Him as He is*” (1 John iii. 1, 2).

3. *Other supernatural gifts* connected with sanctifying grace, and perfecting God’s likeness in man, were at the same time conferred upon our first parents.

a. Their minds were endowed with *extraordinary knowledge*. God “gave them counsel and a tongue, . . . and He filled them with the *knowledge of understanding*. He created in them the *science* of the spirit. He filled their heart with *wisdom*, and showed them both good and evil” (Ecclus. xvii. 5, 6). This knowledge which was given to them related both to natural and supernatural things. Adam gave proof of natural knowledge by giving to the creatures the names corresponding to their nature; he gave proof of supernatural knowledge when, as the Council of Trent says (Sess. xxiv. de mat.), at the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, he declared the indissolubility of marriage, saying: “Therefore shall a man leave father and mother and cling to his wife” (Gen. ii. 23, 24).

b. Their *will* possessed such power over their sensual appetite that they were wholly *exempt from concupiscence*, i.e., free from inordinate passions, and from the rebellion of the flesh against the spirit. “They were both naked, and were not ashamed” (Gen. ii. 25). For, as St. Augustine remarks (de pecc. merit. et remiss. II. c. 22), “the order of justice effected that as the soul obeyed God so the body obeyed the soul and submitted to it without opposition.” The same truth follows from the teaching of the Council of Trent (Sess. v. can. 5), that concupiscence is the product of sin.

c. In regard to the *body* our first parents were *immortal*. “God created man incorruptible, but by the envy of the devil death came into the world” (Wis. ii. 23, 24). “The body, indeed, is dead because of sin” (Rom. viii. 10). Hence the Council of Trent (ib. can. 1) teaches that Adam “by his dis-

Man.

obedience incurred death." Though the body naturally tends to dissolution and death, if man had persevered in the state of innocence God would have preserved his vitality, protected him from outward dangers, and, finally, transferred him to everlasting bliss, without his having tasted death. This immortality was, nevertheless, as St. Paul tells us (1 Cor. xv. 45), less perfect than that promised to the blessed in heaven; for, while the glorified bodies will need no nutriment, our first parents were to nourish themselves from the fruits of the earth.

d. Our first parents were *exempt from sufferings*. As they were exempt from death so they were also free from all those ills that lead to death. Therefore the many evils which now afflict humanity, though resulting from the nature of the body, are so many consequences and punishments of sin; for **it** was by the disobedience of our first parent that this state of happiness was lost to posterity (Trid. Sess. v. can. 2). To this state of external happiness belonged, besides the blissful abode in *Paradise*, the *perfect dominion* over nature and all its living creatures.

II. Those gifts bestowed on our first parents were *supernatural* and, therefore, constituted their *supernatural likeness* to God.

All those prerogatives of our first parents taken collectively are called *original justice*. While we may consider sanctifying grace as the source of exemption from concupiscence, and immunity from death, that superior knowledge vouchsafed to Adam may be regarded as conferred on him by a special dispensation as the head and educator of the human race.

That these prerogatives were supernatural is manifest from their relation to human nature as well as from the teaching of the Church.

1. By *sanctifying grace*, according to the teaching of St. Paul, we are made the adopted sons of God (Gal. iv. 5). It, therefore, confers on us rights which naturally do not belong to us. The right to a future happiness consisting in the beatific vision is the result of this adoption. Now, this adoption being a gift far exceeding the claims of nature, the beatific

Man the Supernatural Image of God.

vision, that happiness resulting from it, is also a supernatural gift (cf. 3, 7, 102).

2. The *exemption from concupiscence* is not grounded in nature, nor in any way due to nature. For, as every faculty naturally tends to its peculiar object, the sensitive faculties seek their own sensual enjoyment and thus give rise to a conflict with reason; for man, endowed as he is with free will, can lawfully allow them only those enjoyments which reason and the moral law approve. It was no small boon to man that he was exempt from the rebellion of the flesh against the spirit; for although the first involuntary sensual motions are of themselves not sinful, yet they are irksome and dangerous; and without the dominion of reason man does not possess perfect harmony within him. By a laborious struggle he can now, with God's assistance, restore the lost harmony. Since, therefore, God gave to man the means of restoring harmony between reason and sense, that is, free will, He has in a certain measure restored to him that harmony itself, as far as human nature can claim it. Consequently, we cannot say that exemption from the rebellion of the flesh, as possessed by our first parents, is due to man's nature. All that man can claim is the power to restore the original order by the dominion of free will. The same may be said in regard to that superior *knowledge* granted to our first parents; for if God left man to his own natural powers also in this regard, "He would not," as St. Augustine (Retract. I. c. 9, n. 6) teaches, "therefore deserve blame, but praise."

3. The *immortality* of the body was a *supernatural gift*. Death, with its accompanying sufferings, is the result of man's nature, which neither God's goodness nor His wisdom required that He should avert from His creature: not His goodness, for this attribute does not oblige God to bestow all possible benefits on man; not His wisdom, for His wisdom only requires that He give His creatures the necessary means to attain to their end. But man could gain his end without the gift of *immortality*.

Hence it follows that God could have created man in a *purely*

Man.

natural state (in statu naturæ puræ), i.e., without sanctifying grace, without a supernatural end, and without those supernatural gifts which He bestowed on our first parents. In this case God would have given man the means necessary to attain to his end; but these means, and the end itself, would have been in that case of the natural order. Death and sufferings, which are now the punishments of sin, would have been merely natural consequences. In like manner, the struggle resulting from the rebellion of the senses against reason would exist. But in any case, the external difficulties coming from the assaults of the evil one would not be so great as at present; for, after the fall Satan acts the part of a victor towards the vanquished. We may also reasonably suppose that in the natural state God would render it comparatively easy for man to attain to his end by abundant external help, by a bountiful providence in the government of the world, as well as in the guidance of individuals. In this supposition a supernatural revelation of the truths of natural religion would not be morally necessary, since man's external difficulties, as we suppose, would be less, and his external helps more abundant. Hence the Church condemned the proposition: "God could not have created man from the beginning as he is born at present [i.e., bereft of all supernatural gifts]."

111. Adam was destined to be the father of the human race not only according to the flesh, but also according to the spirit.

Adam received the supernatural gifts comprised in original justice (110), particularly sanctifying grace, not only for himself, but also for all his descendants. This is true of Adam alone as the head and representative of the human race; not of Eve, though she, too, possessed the same gifts.

1. This is intimated in the words: "Increase, and multiply, and fill the earth, and subdue it; and *rule . . . over the whole earth*" (Gen. i. 28). Here God confers on man that sovereign *dominion* which was the result of his supernatural elevation (110). If this dominion is to continue in Adam's descendants, so also its cause, or source—man's supernatural likeness to God—is to be transmitted. Moreover, Scripture represents Christ as the *new Adam*, who imparts to His spiritual posterity the inheritance of His justice, in the same way as the first Adam was destined to bequeath to his descendants the spiritual goods entrusted to him (Rom. v. 16-19).

2. This is the express *teaching of the Church*. The Second Council of Orange (can. 19), says that human nature, that is, the human race, "*had received salvation in Adam.*" The Council of Trent (Sess. v. can. 2), declares that Adam "*lost*

Trial and Transgression of our First Parents.

the sanctity and justice received, not only for *himself*, but also *for us*." But he could not have *lost it for us*, if he had not also *received it for us*.

Adam was, therefore, destined to be the father of the human race spiritually as well as physically, being the mediator through whom God intended to confer His spiritual favors on man. His descendants were to inherit their natural gifts by descent from him, but sanctifying grace and the mastery over the passions were to be directly infused by God Himself into the soul. While Adam, as the head and educator of the human race, received an extensive infused knowledge at his creation, his descendants would in all probability be left to acquire their knowledge by observation and instruction (S. Thom. I. q. 100, a. 1; q. 101, a. 1). Finally, immortality would be ensured to all by a supernatural preservation of their natural vitality, and by a special divine providence (S. Thom. I. q. 97, a. 4).

The *wisdom* and *goodness* of God is especially manifested in the fact that He made man himself the mediator through whom His supernatural gifts were to be transmitted to the human race. Thus a wonderful harmony was established between the natural and the supernatural order, and man was made the dispenser of supernatural grace to man.

112. Our first parents, being subjected to a probation, transgressed the divine command, and thus incurred the severest penalties.

1. Like the angels (102), so also our first parents were *subjected to a trial*. Since God from mere benevolence had given such gifts and graces to our first parents, He was free to make their continuation and transmission to posterity dependent on certain conditions. The probation chosen by God was obedience to His command not to eat of the fruit of a certain tree (Gen. ii. 17). If it pleased God in His wisdom that mankind should inherit the graces He had destined for them by their descent from Adam, it is no less in keeping with His wisdom to make the actual transmission of these gifts dependent on the *obedience* of the head of our race.

If Adam had not sinned and lost the gifts destined for his descendants, yet each individual would have to undergo a like trial, and would thus be exposed to the danger of losing the graces received (S. Thom. I. q. 100, a. 2).

2. Our first parents *transgressed* God's command, and thereby committed a sin that was all the more grievous because, considering the abundance of gifts and graces imparted

Man.

to them, they could easily have obeyed the divine precept. They were not swayed by immoderate passions, but sinned with full deliberation, notwithstanding the greatness of God's favors and the severity of His menaces.

3. The *consequences* of the transgression for our first parents themselves were manifold (Trid. Sess. v. can. 1.).

a. They lost the *supernatural gifts*: (1) *sanctifying grace*, and with it the supernatural life of the soul, and the supernatural likeness to God. For it is sanctifying grace that makes man the friend and child of God, while sin deprives him of the divine friendship and sonship, and, consequently, of sanctifying grace, which is inseparable from it. Spiritual death took the place of the spiritual, supernatural *life of grace*; divine *wrath* took the place of the *friendship* of God; and the *slavery* of Satan succeeded the *adoption* of the children of God. (2) They lost those *preternatural gifts* which resulted from sanctifying grace: dominion over the passions, immortality of the body. Sickness and sufferings, the forerunners of death, ensued.

b. The loss of the supernatural gifts produced the most baneful effects upon the *natural faculties* and the *external conditions* of our first parents. (1) Since original justice no longer controlled the functions of their soul, their *understanding* was darkened and their *will* weakened. (2) Driven out of Paradise, they were forced to till the earth in the *sweat of their brow*. (3) Nature no longer willingly submitted to their sway; they became sensible of the discomforts that awaited them now that they no longer enjoyed the special protection of God; the very thistles and thorns which the earth brought forth even before man's fall became an instrument for man's punishment.

c. The *future punishments* which our first parents incurred were twofold. Having turned away from God, their last end, they incurred the *pain of loss*, or banishment from the presence of God; having turned to God's creatures, they incurred likewise the *pain of sense*; having, like Satan, rebelled against God, they incurred, like him, the *eternal pains* of hell.

Original Sin Transmitted to all Men.

113. Adam's sin has been inherited by all his posterity.

1. This dogma is manifest from the *teaching of the Apostle*: "As by one man sin entered into this world, and by sin death, and so death passed upon all men *in whom all have sinned*. . . . Therefore as by the offence of one unto all men to *condemnation*: so also by the justice of one unto all men to *justification* of life. For as by the *disobedience of one man many were made sinners*: so also by the obedience of one many shall be made just" (Rom. v. 12, 18, 19).

Here there is question of a *true* sin, which is inherent in each individual. For *all* are under condemnation. But no one is condemned unless he is a sinner in the true sense of the word, i.e., under the guilt of sin. This sin is further contrasted with the *justification* through Christ. But justification is something real, intrinsic, and inherent in the individual; therefore this sin is a real and true sin clinging to all men. There is, furthermore, question of a sin *inherited* by all, not of a personal sin. For all who are subject to death, also *children*, are subject to this sin. But children are incapable of personal sin; consequently, they are sinners inasmuch as they have inherited the sin of Adam. Again, Christ redeemed all, *also children*; therefore they, too, have sinned in Adam, and that only inasmuch as they *inherited* the sin of Adam, not by the evil example of Adam; for infant children are incapable of taking scandal (Eph. ii. 3; Ps. l. 7).

2. That all men sinned in Adam was the constant *teaching of the Church*. It always considered *baptism*, which, according to its professions of faith, is conferred *for the remission of sins*, as necessary even for infants in order to enter the kingdom of heaven. By this belief it implies that children also are under the curse of sin. All those *sects* that fell away from the Church in the early ages have preserved this doctrine; which fact of itself is sufficient to prove that this belief prevailed in the Church from the beginning. Even Pelagius (in the fifth century), who denied the existence of original sin, was so convinced of the universal belief of the Church in this doctrine that at first he ventured to oppose it only in secret. The Council of Trent (Sess. v. can. 2) in its definition of this article of faith only reiterates the numerous decrees of synods and papal utterances issued against Pelagius.

Man.

3. In regard to the *nature* of original sin we must, above all, adhere to the Church's definitions. According to these original sin is the *death* of the soul, and is *inherent* in each individual as his own (Trid. ib. can. 3). But by the grace of Jesus Christ, conferred in baptism, its entire guilt is taken away, and all that is truly sin is remitted and cancelled, not merely not imputed (ib. can. 5).

a. Hence follows the erroneousness of various opinions put forward in regard to the nature of original sin. (1) Original sin does not consist in *concupiscence*, as the so-called reformers of the sixteenth century asserted. For concupiscence remains also in those who are baptized, even in the saints (Rom. vii. 23); whereas, as the Council of Trent teaches, original sin is entirely remitted by baptism, and the soul is born again and thoroughly renewed. (2) Nor does original sin consist in the *disharmony* between reason and sense, which we have inherited from Adam. For baptism, which entirely cleanses us from original sin, does not restore this harmony. Nor does that holiness which is restored to us by baptism consist in harmony between reason and sense. Therefore original sin does not consist in the disturbance of that harmony. (3) It does not consist in the *death* of the body, nor in corporal affliction, nor in any kind of bodily disorder. For baptism does not take away any of these. St. Paul (Rom. v.), moreover, actually distinguishes between death and sin. (4) Original sin is not the mere external *imputation* of the personal sin of Adam as ours inasmuch as God regards it as such. For, according to the teaching of the Council of Trent original sin is something intrinsically *inherent* in man, as is the justification by which the sinner is sanctified: it is the *death* of the soul in the same manner as sanctifying grace is its spiritual life.

b. According to the teaching of approved divines original sin is the state of *aversion from God*, our supernatural end, which by the *sin of Adam* has been inherited by all his descendants; or, what comes to the same, it is the *privation of sanctifying grace* brought upon Adam's descendants by his *disobedience*. We may therefore consider sin in two different phases—as an *act* and as a *state*. As an act sin may be the work of an instant; but the state resulting from the act is permanent; and so long as a man perseveres in this state he is a sinner. His state is one of aversion from God, and can be changed only by sanctifying grace. Adam by his disobedience turned away from God, his natural and supernatural end. The state resulting from this act, inasmuch as it was an aversion from God as man's supernatural end, has, therefore, become *our state*, since Adam, as the medium of salvation, received sanctifying grace, not only *for himself*, but also *for us* (111); therefore as our head he lost this supernatural life also *for us*.

This explanation comprises all the essential elements of sin: *aversion from God*, or the privation of sanctifying grace, and that *guilt*

Effects of Original Sin.

which constitutes the state of sin. Hence we can understand why, if God had created him without sanctifying grace, man's state would not have been a state of sin. It became a state of sin by its relation to the sin of our first parent. For the same reason our souls at present are *not* created precisely *as* under the curse of sin. They are created, it is true, without sanctifying grace. But it is only by their union with the body, which, however, takes place at the moment of creation, that they become the souls of the children of Adam, and, consequently, of sinners. Thus the state of privation of sanctifying grace, in which we enter this world, is a state of sin; for in the person of Adam we have forfeited that grace which God intended we should possess.

114. The effects of original sin extend to the natural as well as to the supernatural prerogatives of man.

I. Original sin effaced the *supernatural image* of God in the descendants of Adam.

1. By original sin they lost the *adoption of the children of God* conferred in sanctifying grace. The loss of *sanctifying grace* itself, though it may be considered as constituting the essence of sin, is itself a consequence of sin. Inasmuch as God withdraws sanctifying grace from man, it is a punishment for sin; inasmuch as man, by the will of Adam, his spiritual head, lost this gift and thus turned away from his supernatural end, and continues in this state, the privation of sanctifying grace constitutes habitual sin.

2. The children of Adam also lost the *right to supernatural bliss*, connected with sanctifying grace: "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven" (John iii. 5). Hence the descendants of Adam are in a *state of condemnation* (Rom. v. 16). For exclusion from supernatural happiness—the beatific vision—as a consequence of original sin is a real condemnation or punishment; whereas in the state of pure nature it would be only man's natural condition.

There is no evidence that the *pain of sense*, or positive punishment, is connected with this exclusion from supernatural happiness for such as have not committed personal sins. The contrary opinion is held by approved divines as the more probable, because original sin as inherited by the descendants of Adam consists only in the aversion from God without the conversion to His creatures.

3. The descendants of Adam lost also their *preternatural*

gifts—exemption from concupiscence and immortality—and became subject to the rebellion of the flesh against the spirit, to death and its attendant trials and sufferings. “The imagination and thought of man’s heart are prone to evil from his youth” (Gen. viii. 21). Concupiscence and death may be justly regarded as penalties, because they are the results of original sin.

II. Though original sin did not efface, yet it impaired, the *natural image of God* in man; it weakened his faculties not in their intrinsic nature, but inasmuch as it deprived them of that supernatural justice by which they were to be shielded and directed.

1. Original sin obscured man’s *understanding*; for the inordinate passions impede the free use of reason and lead it to mistake falsehood for truth and evil for good.

2. It weakened man’s *will*. Errors of judgment also mislead the will. Moreover, its freedom of choice is hindered by those inordinate passions which violently draw men to earthly and perishable things.

Original sin, however, neither extinguished the light of reason nor destroyed the freedom of the human will, as has been shown (109) in connection with man’s natural likeness to God (cf. Trid. Sess. vi. can. 5). Nor is man’s understanding in a state of total darkness in regard to the truths of religion; for how could it arrive at the knowledge of the existence of God and of the general principles of morality, if it were altogether blind in religious matters? That human reason is capable of knowing some religious truths is beyond all doubt (73).

Disclaimer

Please note that opinions expressed in signed articles in Daylight are not necessarily shared by the Editor.

gifts—exemption from concupiscence and immortality—and became subject to the rebellion of the flesh against the spirit, to death and its attendant trials and sufferings. “The imagination and thought of man’s heart are prone to evil from his youth” (Gen. viii. 21). Concupiscence and death may be justly regarded as penalties, because they are the results of original sin.

II. Though original sin did not efface, yet it impaired, the *natural image of God* in man; it weakened his faculties not in their intrinsic nature, but inasmuch as it deprived them of that supernatural justice by which they were to be shielded and directed.

1. Original sin obscured man’s *understanding*; for the inordinate passions impede the free use of reason and lead it to mistake falsehood for truth and evil for good.

2. It weakened man’s *will*. Errors of judgment also mislead the will. Moreover, its freedom of choice is hindered by those inordinate passions which violently draw men to earthly and perishable things.

Original sin, however, neither extinguished the light of reason nor destroyed the freedom of the human will, as has been shown (109) in connection with man’s natural likeness to God (cf. Trid. Sess. vi. can. 5). Nor is man’s understanding in a state of total darkness in regard to the truths of religion; for how could it arrive at the knowledge of the existence of God and of the general principles of morality, if it were altogether blind in religious matters? That human reason is capable of knowing some religious truths is beyond all doubt (73).

Disclaimer

Please note that opinions expressed in signed articles in Daylight are not necessarily shared by the Editor.

OUR AMAZING ANCESTORS!

IT is generally believed that man began as an ignorant, brutish "ape-man", gradually progressing through various stages to modern man. Our earliest ancestors were supposedly "primitive" and their culture very crude in comparison with ours. However, the available evidence does not support the evolutionary view, in fact, it shows the *opposite* — that early human beings were very advanced, and in many cases, knowledge which they possessed has actually been *lost*.

ANCIENT CHINA:

There is considerable evidence that many ancient cultures were highly advanced, both technically and culturally. The **Chinese** invented and used many things which were unknown in the western world until centuries later. Some examples are: belt drives for machinery in use in the 1st century BC. (first used in Europe around 1430 AD.), paper, made in the 2nd. century BC. (not appearing in Europe until the 11th. century AD.), manned kites - similar to modern hang-gliders - in the 4th. century BC. (first used in Europe in the 19th. century), multi-tube seed drills in the 2nd. century BC., (not "invented" in Europe until the 16th. century AD.), and using petroleum and natural gas as fuel in the 4th. century BC. (this included storing the gas, and piping it through bamboo pipelines). The Chinese also used magnetic compasses for navigation in the 4th century BC., discovered the hexagonal structure of snowflakes in the 2nd. century BC., and used decimal fractions in the 1st. century BC..¹

EGYPTIAN TECHNOLOGY:

The ancient **Egyptians** were also very advanced, especially in building construction, and the pyramids are a prime example. The Great Pyramid of Cheops, built around 2,500 BC., is the height of a 30-storey building, and composed of massive blocks of stone, some thought to weigh as much as 30 tonnes. In total, about 2.3 million

blocks were used, the base area is 13 1/2 acres, and its foundations have not sagged in 4,400 years! How did the ancient Egyptians transport these massive stones from a distant quarry and elevate them to such a height? Some researchers have suggested that the pyramids were built from concrete, cast *in situ*², although this is hotly disputed. Either way, the western world has taken centuries to catch up.

It seems that the Egyptians also knew something about aerodynamics, for a model aeroplane was discovered in one of the pyramids in 1898. This was 5 years before the Wright brothers first flew, and it was first described as a "bird model". Later, it was re-labelled as a model aeroplane; this 2000-year-old model has precisely the same wing form and proportions as the supersonic Concorde! The ancient Egyptian technologists always made scale models of things they planned to build, so we are forced to consider the possibility that these ancient people designed, and may even have used, flying machines.³





OTHER CIVILISATIONS:

In many other parts of the world, we find evidence of great civilisations who possessed great skill and knowledge. The ancient **Polynesians** traversed 15 million square miles of the Pacific Ocean before 400 AD., navigating by the stars. They understood ocean currents and swells, two phenomena only discovered by western civilisation in so-called "modern times". The Polynesians were also responsible for the famous stone statues on Easter Island. At least 1000 of these statues exist, ranging in size from 3 feet (1 metre) high, to a massive 32 feet (10 metres) high and about 90 tonnes in weight. Some are still lying in the quarry where they were sculptured, but most were transported several miles overland to the erection site. Even modern engineers would find this a challenge, yet these supposedly "primitive" people

achieved this great feat.

In Central America the ruins of ancient cities containing many pyramid-like buildings have been discovered, now overgrown by jungle. These are the remains of the **Mayan** civilisation, which flourished for 1,000 years, before collapsing in the 8th. century AD. The Mayans were very knowledgeable in technology and science, inventing a cosmic clock to predict solstices and equinoxes. The Mayan year was 365.2420 days long; only recently, modern astronomers have calculated the solar year to be 365.2422 days. Clearly, the Mayans were very advanced, yet today the area is inhabited by Indian tribes with quite simple lifestyles. Even evolutionary scientists are now admitting that primitive tribes are not relics of the "Stone Age", but are the descendents of sophisticated ancestors.⁴

EVIDENCE FITS BIBLE RECORD:

The evidence that the ancients were very advanced is overwhelming, and evolutionists often describe this as "a mystery", as it does not fit their theory of human progress. All of this, though, accords perfectly with the Biblical record of early human history. If Adam was created with perfect mental abilities, there is no reason why the human race should not have been inventive, creative and ingenious from the beginning. We use less than 10% of our brain's capacity, but given the longevity of people before the flood — around 900 years — the amount of knowledge that would have accumulated and been passed on must have been amazing. Nearly every great civilisation has reached a point of ruin and destruction, brought about by wickedness and rebellion against God. Technical know-how has been lost and had to be rediscovered; the words of Solomon ring true: "**There is nothing new under the sun. Is there anything of which one can say, 'Look! This is something new'?** It was here already, long ago; it was here before our time."⁵

REFERENCES:

1. See *China: Land of Discovery and Invention*, Robert V Temple, Patrick Stephens Ltd., Wellingborough, 1986.
2. "Ancient & Modern Concretes: What is the Real Difference?" Joseph Davidovits. *Concrete International*, Dec. 1987 pp 23-28.
3. *Ancient Man: A Handbook of Puzzling Artifacts*, William R Corliss, Sourcebook Project, 1978, pp. 454-455.
4. "Modern Hunter-gatherers no guide to Stone Age past", *New Scientist*, Vol. 137, No. 1861, 20th. February 1993, p. 8.
5. *Ecclesiastes 1: 9b-10*. (N.I.V.).

The “Bible Alone” is Not Enough

Answers to 25 questions on the History of New Testament which completely refute the Protestant’s “Bible Only” Theory

-taken from “The Catholic Religion Proved by the Protestant Bible”.

[Part 1 : Questions 1 - 12]

ONE

Did Our Lord write any part of the New Testament or command His Apostles to do so? Our Lord Himself never wrote a line, nor is there any record that He ordered his Apostles to write; He did command them to teach and to preach. Also He to whom all power was given in Heaven and on earth (Matt. 28-18) promised to give them the Holy Spirit (John 14-26) and to be with them Himself till the end of the world. (Mat. 28-20).

COMMENT: If reading the Bible were a necessary means of salvation, Our Lord would have made that statement and also provided the necessary means for his followers.

TWO

How many of the Apostles or others actually wrote what is now in the New Testament? A few of the Apostles wrote part of Our Lord's teachings, as they themselves expressly stated; i.e. Peter, Paul, James, John, Jude, Matthew, also Ss. Mark and Luke. None of the others wrote anything, so far as is recorded.

COMMENT: If the Bible privately interpreted was to be a Divine rule of Faith, the apostles would have been derelict in their duty when instead, some of them adopted preaching only.

THREE

Was it a teaching or a Bible-reading Church that Christ founded? The Protestant Bible expressly states that Christ founded a teaching Church, which existed before any of the New Testament books were written.

Rom. 10-17: So then faith cometh by **HEARING** and hearing by the word of God.

Matt. 28-19; Go ye therefore and **TEACH** all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

Mark. 16-20: And they went forth, and **PREACHED** everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following. Amen.

Mark 16-15: And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and **PREACH** the gospel to every creature.

COMMENT: Thus falls the entire basis of the 'Bible-only' theory.

FOUR

Was there any drastic difference between what Our Lord commanded the Apostles to teach and what the New Testament contains? Our Lord commanded his Apostles to teach *all things* whatsoever He had commanded; (Matt. 28-20); His Church must necessarily teach everything; (John 14-26); however, the Protestant Bible itself teaches that the Bible does not contain all of Our Lord's doctrines:

John 20-30: And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book, etc.

John 21-25: And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written. Amen.

COMMENT: How would it have been possible for second century Christians to practice Our Lord's religion, if private interpretation of an *unavailable* and only *partial account* of Christ's teaching were indispensable?

FIVE

Does the New Testament expressly refer to Christ's "unwritten word"?

The New Testament itself teaches that it does not contain all that Our Lord did or, consequently, all that He taught.

John 20-30: And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book, etc.

John 21-25: And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written everyone, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written. Amen.

COMMENT: Since the Bible is incomplete, it needs something else to supplement it; i.e., the spoken or historically recorded word which we call Tradition.

SIX

What became of the unwritten truths which Our Lord and the Apostles taught? The Church had carefully conserved this 'word of mouth' teaching by historical records called Tradition. Even the Protestant Bible teaches that many Christian truths were to be handed down by word of mouth.

2 Thes. 2-15: Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle.

Tim. 2-2: And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.

COMMENT: Hence not only Scripture but other sources of information must be consulted to get the whole of Christ's teaching. Religions founded on 'the Bible only' are therefore necessarily incomplete.

SEVEN

Between what years were the first and last books of the New Testament written? This first book, St. Matthew's Gospel, was not written until about ten years after Our Lord's Ascension. St. John's fourth gospel and Apocalypse or Book of Revelations were not written until about 100 A.D.

COMMENT: Imagine how the present-day privately interpreted 'Bible-only' theory would have appeared at a time when the books of the New Testament were not only unavailable, but most of them had not yet been written.

EIGHT

When was the New Testament placed under one cover? In 397 A.D. by the Council of Carthage, from which it follows that non-Catholics have derived their New Testament from the Catholic Church; no other source was available.

COMMENT: Up to 397 A.D., *some* of the Christians had access to *part* of the New Testament; into this situation, how would the 'Bible-only privately interpreted' theory have fitted?

NINE

Why so much delay in compiling the New Testament? Prior to 397 A.D., the various books of the New Testament were not under one cover, but were in the custody of different groups or congregations. The persecutions against the Church, which had gained new intensity, prevented these New Testament books from being properly authenticated and placed under one cover. However, this important work was begun after Constantine gave peace to Christianity in 313 A.D., allowing it to be practiced in the Roman Empire.

COMMENT: This again shows how utterly impossible was the 'Bible-only' theory, at least up to 400 A.D.

TEN

What other problem confronted those who wished to determine the contents of the New Testament? Before the inspired books were recognized as such, many other books has been written and many were thought to be inspired; hence the Catholic Church made a thorough examination of the whole question; biblical scholars spent years in the Holy Land studying languages of New Testament writings.

COMMENT: According to the present-day 'Bible-only' theory, in the above

circumstances, it would also have been necessary for early Christians to read all the doubtful books and, by interior illumination, judge which were and which were not divinely inspired.

ELEVEN

Who finally did decide which books were inspired and therefore belonged to the New Testament? Shortly before 400 A.D. a General Council of the Catholic Church, using the infallible authority which Christ had given to His own Divine institution, finally decided which books really belonged to the New Testament and which did not.

Either the Church at this General Council was infallible, or it was not.

If the Church was infallible then, why is it not infallible now? If the Church was not infallible then, in that case the New Testament is not worth the paper it is written on, because internal evidences of authenticity and inspiration are inconclusive and because the work of this Council cannot now be rechecked; this is obvious from reply to next question.

COMMENT: In view of these historical facts, it is difficult to see how non-Catholics can deny that it was from the (Roman) Catholic Church that they received the New Testament.

TWELVE

Why is it impossible for modern non-Catholics to check over the work done by the Church previous to 400 A.D.? The original writings were on frail material called papyrus, which had but temporary enduring qualities. While the books judged to be inspired by the Catholic Church were carefully copied by her monks, those rejected at that time were allowed to disintegrate, for lack of further interest in them.

COMMENT: What then is left for non-Catholics, except to trust the Catholic Church to have acted under divine inspiration; if at that time, why not now?

Republished with permission from:
Crying in the Wilderness Newsletter [Spring 1994]
Most Holy Family Monastery,

To be concluded in the next issue.

Wallace Johnson on Evolution

Slide show on CD-ROM.

Ten years ago, to humour a friend, I read Father O'Connell's "Science Of Today And The Problems Of Genesis." My belief in evolution disintegrated, accompanied by anger that a whole counter-argument had been kept from me for so long. At the same time I began to discern evolution's potential threat to religion. I resolved to equip myself to help others to hear the counter-argument which was being so effectively suppressed.

Wallace Johnson, in Foreword to *Evolution?*

One of the first audio-cassettes I ever heard by a Catholic speaker on Evolution, over twenty years ago, was "A Wolf in Sheep's Clothing," by Wallace Johnson: recordings of four lectures of about half an hour each, which had been accompanied by a series of 35mm slides. Listeners to the tape, of course, heard only the 'ping' and had to use their imagination for the pictures. Many people share my view that these talks still provide a masterly introduction to the subject, covering a wide range of relevant issues. The tapes have been available in Britain since the late 1970s thanks to the invaluable apostolate of **John Edwards** of *Christus Vincit Productions*. In the USA in 1976, the recording was converted into a booklet called *The Case Against Evolution*, later rewritten and published in Australia as *The Crumbling Theory of Evolution* (1982), with the *Imprimatur* of Archbishop Rush of Brisbane, and re-published as *Evolution?* in 1986. Until the appearance of *Creation Rediscovered* by **Gerard Keane** in 1991 (2nd Edition 1999), these books were the only recent substantial works in print in English on the Creation/Evolution debate from a Catholic standpoint. Wallace Johnson died on SS Peter and Paul's day, 1989.

I had long hoped to see the slides used in the lectures and this has now been made possible in a new CD-ROM [for Pentium PC with Audio]. The four lectures are entitled: Mutations, Variation and Fossils; Ape men?; Geology, Dating, the Flood and Outer Space; and Anthropology. There are 150 slides, with Index and easy access to any point in the programme. The religious implications are considered briefly in the introduction. Permission is given for FREE copying and distribution of the unaltered slide show, thanks to the producers Paul Kelly and Dr Josef Holzschuh Ph.D.

This new resource provides a valuable alternative medium for promoting the message and I hope many of you can make use of it. There is no charge but a donation is invited of £2 per copy to cover production and mailing costs. Thank you very much.

A.N.



"SPECTRUM"



Extracts from your correspondence

"Thanks for still sending the magazine to me - and for your heroic efforts in assembling and writing for the magazine and keeping us all informed with the developments of this highly complex subject." *S.A., London.*



"Looking forward to reading the next issue of Daylight which I find to be the only Roman Catholic magazine which upholds the Truth i.e. Creation and Original Sin as opposed to the heretical Doctrine of Evolution." *J.B., Ireland.*



"Keep up the good work. Daylight is a wonderful journal - thoroughly informative, corrective of error and orthodox. I only wish it was a monthly publication." *R.G., Manchester.*



"Thank you very much for sending me the last issue of Daylight. It is a great source of learning." *M.S., Czech Rep.*



"I enjoy very much reading 'Daylight' - I hope you will keep sending it to us." *Fr. P. M., France.*



"Thank you very much for continuing to send me your great publication. I wonder whether there will ever be an honest debate in the media?" *M.K., Surrey.*



"I obtained your name and address through an E-Mail enquiry on the Daylight website. I am interested in Creationism vs Evolution arguments & should like to subscribe to 'Daylight' magazine." *D.W., Kent*



"I purchased your talk on 'The Origins Imposture' from C.V. Productions and I think it's absolutely excellent. I am reminded that I have allowed my subscription to 'Daylight' to lapse. I enclose a cheque for — and I wish you God's blessing on your work." *A.C., Essex.*



"Your latest edition of 'Daylight' is excellent ... Your materials are invaluable for homeschooling. It was Kay McDonald (R.I.P.) who both encouraged us to homeschool our children and introduced us to 'Daylight'." *T.W., Cornwall.*



DAYLIGHT ORIGINS SOCIETY

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

January 2000 - December 2000

INCOME	£
Subscriptions	525
Donations	216
Books and tapes	1431
Videos	156
Interest	26
Opening credit	1057
Total income of year	2354
	<u>3411</u>

EXPENDITURE	£
Printing/copying	595
Postage	524
Stationery/office	194
Books and tapes	1282
Videos	150
Telephone/electricity	50
Meetings/travel	100
Subscriptions	47
Total expenses	2942
Credit balance	469
	<u>3411</u>

NOTES

1. Only two issues of 'Daylight' were produced over the year, so credit for subscriptions has allowed for this.
2. Most of the increased costs and income relate to the new edition of Creation Rediscovered.
3. Video expenses are royalty payments to the producer.

Our Heavenly Patrons

St.Thomas Aquinas (March 7th)

Born in 1226, he entered the Dominicans in 1243 and is renowned for his teaching of philosophy and theology, collected in the 19-volume treatise "*Summa Theologica*". He has been styled 'The Angelic Doctor' on account of his humility. Butler writes of him: "Nothing was more remarkable than his meekness on all occasions. His temper was never ruffled in the heat of any dispute, nor by any insult." For his great wisdom, he has been proclaimed patron of Catholic schools. He died on March 7th, 1274.

We have good reason to pray to St. Thomas for a calm manner in dealing with these contentious and emotive issues and for his assistance in eradicating the false philosophies being taught unchallenged in many schools today.

St.Bonaventure (July 14th)

Born in 1221, his life was saved from grave illness through the intercession of St.Francis. In gratitude, Bonaventure joined the Franciscans in 1243. Known as 'The Seraphic Doctor', his zeal and clarity of theological teaching was matched by an ardent charity for God and his fellow man. In 1272, he wrote the 'Hexaameron on the Six Days of Creation', and soon afterwards was made Cardinal of Albano. His doctrinal expositions at the Council of Lyons made a valuable contribution to the healing of schisms. He died on July 14th, 1274.

One famous reply he made to his friend St.Thomas, when pointing to a crucifix he said: "This is the source of all my knowledge. I study only Jesus Christ, and Him crucified."

May St.Bonaventure guide us in expounding the doctrine of creation with charity, especially towards our separated Christian brethren.

St. Michael the Archangel (September 29th)

The name Michael means, in Hebrew, "who is like to God?" and recalls the battle in heaven between "the prince of the heavenly host" and the devil, a battle which began with Lucifer's rebellion and continues down the ages. St. Michael and his angels are Christ's allies against Satan and his devils, who have wrought such havoc in Catholic souls through the spread of false and deceitful philosophies and errors, provoking enmity even between fellow Catholics over issues like Evolution.

Of all creation, only the angels share our nature in having immortal supernatural souls, and are therefore especially able to assist us in what essentially is a spiritual contest between Divine Truth and satanic falsehood.

As Protector of the Church, we ask St. Michael to help especially the Pope, Hierarchy, Clergy and Religious to understand and reject the errors of evolutionism that are causing such harm to the Church.

The Immaculate Conception (December 8th)

On December 8th 1854, Pope Pius IX defined the dogma: "The most Blessed Virgin Mary ... was preserved free from all stain of original sin." At Lourdes on March 25th 1858, the Feast of the Annunciation, Our Lady declared to St. Bernadette: "I am the Immaculate Conception." Her final appearance at Lourdes was on July 16th of that year.

Meanwhile, in England, on July 1st 1858, Charles Darwin's paper on 'survival of the fittest' was read to the Linnaean Society, following which he began writing 'The Origin of Species', published in 1859. From this work can clearly be traced the source of the modernist attacks on the Christian doctrine of Original Sin, and hence also the above dogma of the Immaculate Conception.

We ask Our Lady to restore in mankind a true understanding of fallen human nature, and recognition and love for her Son, Our Lord Jesus Christ our Redeemer, and His Blessed Mother

Creation Science Audio-Cassettes from CV Productions

A Wolf In Sheep's Clothing
by Wallace Johnson. 2 Cassettes. No. 8-49

Our Origins, Creation or Evolution?
by Fr. A.M. Fides No. 8-64

"Error Will Spread..." & "Adam, Noah, Moses and Us"
by Wallace Johnson No. 8-103

The Distraction of Evolution
by Dr. Wm. A. Marra No. 8-118

A Biologist Looks at Genesis
by Anthony Nevard B.Sc. No. 8-186

Evolution - The Hoax That's Destroying Christendom
by Wallace Johnson No. 8-192

Evolution Takes On God
by Wallace Johnson (Australia) No. 8-305

The Creation / Evolution Controversy
by Peter Wilders No. 8-317

***Humani Generis* - Papal Encyclical**
by Pope Pius XII, read by Fr Hugh Thwaites. No. 8-384

Evolution - A Modern Answer
by Dr. Patrick Gill. No. 8-356

A Philosopher Looks at Science, Evolution & the Faith
by Dr. Wm. A. Marra. No. 8-504

Creation Science - The Catholic Revival
by Anthony Nevard B.Sc. No. 8-574

Teilhard de Chardin - False Prophet
by the Benedictine Fathers of Berlin, N.J., USA., read by Monica Flynn. No. 8-587

Prima Scriptura
by Scott Hahn No. 8-617

The Catechism, Original Sin and Evolution
by Gerard Keane No. 8-674

Doubts about Evolution
by Professor Maciej Giertych No. 8-712

Evolution and the Mother of God
by Dr. Patrick Gill No. 8-763

Creation or Evolution? The Big Issue for Catholics.
by Anthony Nevard B.Sc. No. 8-789

The Relevance of the Origins Debate to the Crisis in the Church.
by Gerry Keane No. 8-810

The Origins Imposture
by Anthony Nevard B.Sc. No. 8-864

Each tape is priced £4.30, sets of two £8.00. UK. postage is included. S.Ireland and overseas should add 15% to cover extra postage. Please remit in STERLING currency, using bank draft.

Christus Vincit Productions, PO Box 14,